UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,991	03/06/2007	Victor A. Raul	DOC 0170 PA	5824
23368 DINSMORE &	7590 07/27/201 SHOHL LLP	EXAMINER		
FIFTH THIRD CENTER, ONE SOUTH MAIN STREET			PIHONAK, SARAH	
SUITE 1300 DAYTON, OH	45402-2023	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ŕ			1627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/27/2010	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/576,991	RAUL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SARAH PIHONAK	1627		

	SARAH PIHONAK	1627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la</li> </ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(fextensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriat nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ul>	·		,
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-7,9-12 and 14-18. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8,13 and 19-41.		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>5/26/201</u>	<u>10</u>	
/SREENI PADMANABHAN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1627			

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No.

Applicants' arguments, filed on 7/6/2010, have been fully considered but do not place the application in condition for allowance. The Applicants have argued that the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) over claims 1-7, 9-12, and 14-18 should be withdrawn, as the claims are directed to a composition which excludes lipophilic solvents, while Kosal et. al. teaches the presence of a volatile solvent, including silicone fluids. The Applicants have asserted as Kosal is silent as to exclusion of lipophilic solvents, Kosal et. al. does not render the claims obvious. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Kosal et. al. teaches an oil-in-water emulsion composition comprised of a pressure sensitive adhesive, a surfactant, and a thickening agent, in which the pressure sensitive is comprised of a cross-linking reaction between a hydroxyl terminated polydiorganosiloxane and a silanol containing silicone resin. Kosal et. al. teaches the presence of silicone fluids; the claims exclude only lipophilic solvents. As discussed in the office action dated 5/10/2010, there exists a variety of silicone fluids, including lipophilic and non-lipophilic types. As Kosal et. al. teaches broadly silicone fluids, and not exclusively lipophilic solvents, the claims would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention. The rejection under 35 USC 103(a) was proper and is maintained, for reasons of record.